



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2019

---

## **The interplay between movement, morphology and dispersal in *Tetrahymena* ciliates**

Pennekamp, Frank ; Clobert, Jean ; Schtickzelle, Nicolas

**Abstract:** Understanding how and why individual movement translates into dispersal between populations is a long-term goal in ecology. Movement is broadly defined as ‘any change in the spatial location of an individual’, whereas dispersal is more narrowly defined as a movement that may lead to gene flow. Because the former may create the condition for the latter, behavioural decisions that lead to dispersal may be detectable in underlying movement behaviour. In addition, dispersing individuals also have specific sets of morphological and behavioural traits that help them coping with the costs of movement and dispersal, and traits that mitigate costs should be under selection and evolve if they have a genetic basis. Here, we experimentally study the relationships between movement behaviour, morphology and dispersal across 44 genotypes of the actively dispersing unicellular, aquatic model organism *Tetrahymena thermophila*. We used two-patch populations to quantify individual movement trajectories, as well as activity, morphology and dispersal rate. First, we studied variation in movement behaviour among and within genotypes (i.e. between dispersers and residents) and tested whether this variation can be explained by morphology. Then, we addressed how much the dispersal rate is driven by differences in the underlying movement behaviour. Genotypes revealed clear differences in terms of movement speed and linearity. We also detected marked movement differences between resident and dispersing individuals, mediated by the genotype. Movement variation was partly explained by morphological properties such as cell size and shape, with larger cells consistently showing higher movement speed and higher linearity. Genetic differences in activity and movement were positively related to the observed dispersal and jointly explained 47% of the variation in dispersal rate. Our study shows that a detailed understanding of the interplay between morphology, movement and dispersal may have potential to improve dispersal predictions over broader spatio-temporal scales.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8197>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-180268>

Journal Article

Published Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Pennekamp, Frank; Clobert, Jean; Schtickzelle, Nicolas (2019). The interplay between movement, morphology and dispersal in *Tetrahymena* ciliates. PeerJ, 7:e8197.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8197>

# The interplay between movement, morphology and dispersal in

## *Tetrahymena ciliates*

Frank Pennekamp<sup>1,2</sup>, Jean Clobert<sup>3</sup> & Nicolas Schtickzelle<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Earth and Life Institute & Biodiversity Research Centre, Université catholique de Louvain, Croix du  
Sud 4, L7.07.04, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

<sup>2</sup>Present address: Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of  
Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Station d'Ecologie Théorique et Expérimentale, CNRS, 09200 Moulis, France

Running head: Movement ecology of Tetrahymena

Words: 6831(including references)

Address of corresponding author:

Frank Pennekamp

Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies

University of Zurich

Winterthurerstrasse 190

CH-8057 Zurich

Switzerland

email: [Frank.Pennekamp@ieu.uzh.ch](mailto:Frank.Pennekamp@ieu.uzh.ch)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0679-1045>

**Code and data are available here:**

<https://figshare.com/s/b7e4b795085dedec6204>

<https://figshare.com/s/54f792836833009ba70d>

## Abstract

Understanding how and why individual movement translates into dispersal between populations is a long-term goal in ecology. Movement is broadly defined as “any change in the spatial location of an individual”, whereas dispersal is more narrowly defined as a movement that may lead to gene flow. Because the former may create the condition for the latter, behavioural decisions that lead to dispersal may be detectable in underlying movement behaviour. In addition, dispersing individuals also have specific sets of morphological and behavioural traits that help them coping with the costs of movement and dispersal, and traits that mitigate costs should be under selection and evolve if they have a genetic basis.

Here we experimentally study the relationships between movement behaviour, morphology and dispersal across 44 genotypes of the actively dispersing unicellular, aquatic model organism *Tetrahymena thermophila*. We used two-patch populations to quantify individual movement trajectories, as well as activity, morphology and dispersal rate. First, we studied variation in movement behaviour among and within genotypes (i.e. between dispersers and residents) and tested whether this variation can be explained by morphology. Then, we address how much the dispersal rate is driven by differences in the underlying movement behaviour.

Genotypes revealed clear differences in terms of movement speed and linearity. We also detected marked movement differences between resident and dispersing individuals, mediated by the genotype. Movement variation was partly explained by morphological properties such as cell size and shape, with larger cells consistently showing higher movement speed and higher linearity. Genetic differences in activity and movement were positively related to the observed dispersal and jointly explained 47% of the variation in dispersal rate. Our study shows that a detailed understanding of the interplay between morphology, movement and dispersal may have potential to improve dispersal predictions over broader spatio-temporal scales.

## Introduction

Individual movement is a universal feature of life with broad implications for the ecology and evolution of species (Turchin, 1998). As most environments are spatially structured, understanding how individuals move across increasingly fragmented landscapes is of crucial importance (Baguette & Van Dyck, 2007). Individual movement can be defined as “any change in the spatial location of an individual in time” (Nathan et al., 2008). Dispersal movements are more specifically defined as the result of a specific movement type, i.e. movement that can potentially (but does not necessarily) lead to gene flow (Baguette, Stevens & Clobert, 2014) and are vital for the persistence of spatially-structured populations. Although dispersal implies a change in spatial position, it goes beyond mere movement: it is a central life history trait (Bonte & Doherty, 2017), which can be conceptualized as a three stage process where decisions are taken during emigration, transition and immigration (Clobert et al., 2009). Movement patterns may hence vary according to the costs of dispersal (Bonte et al., 2012), for instance due to the type of habitat that is encountered (Schickzelle et al., 2007). Few studies try to integrate drivers of small-scale individual movements with dispersal, although previous work has shown the potential of movement to predict large scale spatial dynamics from short spatio-temporal scales, if variation in movement is properly accounted for (Morales & Ellner, 2002). This is important because dispersal has wide implications for population dynamics and the spatial distribution of genetic diversity (Bowler & Benton, 2005; Ronce, 2007; Clobert et al., 2012; Jacob et al., 2015a).

Variation in movement and dispersal, and covariation with traits such as morphology and behaviour, is the raw material for selection in spatially structured environments and can lead to dispersal syndromes, i.e. consistent co-variation among traits (Ronce & Clobert, 2012; Stevens et al., 2012). Variation in both movement and dispersal has been reported within and among many different organisms (Austin, Bowen & McMillan, 2004; Mancinelli, 2010;

Chapperon & Seuront, 2011; Ducatez et al., 2012; Debeffe et al., 2014; Dahirel et al., 2015). Some of this variation can be due to environmental causes (e.g. different resource availability, Fronhofer et al., 2018), but there is also evidence for genetic effects (Haag et al., 2005; Edelsparre et al., 2014). As only the latter can lead to the evolution of dispersal and movement strategies, it is important to understand when dispersal and movement variation is genetically or environmentally based. The development of new technology has recently given us a better grasp on how individual variation in movement is related to dispersal. Individual tracking of roe deer showed that exploratory movements were mainly performed by individuals that would later disperse (Debeffe et al., 2013, 2014), and butterflies show links between movement ability and dispersal (Stevens, Turlure & Baguette, 2010). Currently, effects of proxies like body condition are very species and context-specific. However, movement traits have potential to more generally predict which individuals are most likely to disperse.

Besides movement, differences in morphology, physiology and behaviour have been found when comparing dispersers and residents (Niitepõld et al., 2009; Edelsparre et al., 2014). For instance, body condition and morphology have been found to influence individual dispersal decisions in mole rats, ciliates, lizards and butterflies and many other organisms (O’Riain, Jarvis & Faulkes, 1996; Fjerdingsstad et al., 2007; Clobert et al., 2009; Stevens et al., 2012; Turlure et al., 2016). Body size is another important predictor of movement, and has been shown to directly influence the speed with which animals can move (Hirt et al., 2017a,b). In general, larger animals can move faster, however, the relationship is non-linear with an optimum, suggesting that the largest species are not necessarily the fastest.

Linking individual movement to dispersal requires us to characterize and understand the underlying sources of variation in both, which has so far mostly been done on insects (Niitepõld et al., 2009; Edelsparre et al., 2014). Assessing dispersal and movement simultaneously is

difficult because dispersal events (especially long-distance) are difficult to track in the field, and recording movement behaviour with adequate resolution and sample size is technically challenging, leading to the use of indirect methods (Flaherty, Ben-David & Smith, 2010). Alternatively, relationships between dispersal and movement ability have been studied across taxonomic groups in a comparative fashion (Dahirel et al., 2015). One noteworthy exception using a direct approach is a study that investigated and supported links between phenotypic and genotypic differences in larval food foraging and dispersal as adults in *Drosophila melanogaster* (Edelsparre et al., 2014). “Rover” larvae tend to move longer distances and may leave food patches when foraging, whereas “sitters” tend to move less and rest within their food patch (Osborne et al., 1997). In dispersal assays the “rover” genotype also moved greater distances as adult flies, highlighting genetic links between larval mobility and adult dispersal (Edelsparre et al., 2014). Experiments with microscopic organisms are ideal to study the connections between dispersal and movement experimentally, because they allow tight control of the genetic and environmental context and hence allow these to be disentangled.

Experimental approaches with microscopic organisms are a convenient way to measure movement and dispersal simultaneously and hence allow us to study pattern and process at a relevant spatial scale (Menden-Deuer, 2010; Kuefler, Avgar & Fryxell, 2012). Moreover, controlled experiments can partition how much variation in movement is due to genetic and non-genetic sources and therefore advance our understanding of the mechanistic underpinnings of movement strategies and their evolution. In this study, we used the microbial *Tetrahymena thermophila* experimental system.

There is compelling evidence that dispersal in this organism is not solely a diffusive process, but depends on individual decisions triggered by environmental cues. Previous work has revealed that cells modify their dispersal decisions according to cooperative strategies (Chaine

et al., 2010; Jacob et al., 2016), conspecific density and density proxies (Pennekamp et al., 2014; Fronhofer, Kropf & Altermatt, 2015), social information from conspecifics (Jacob et al., 2015b) as well as competition (Fronhofer et al., 2015), and perform adaptive habitat choice according to thermal preferences (Jacob et al., 2017, 2018). Extensive variation in dispersal has previously been observed among genotypes of this actively moving ciliate, however, the underlying movement processes have remained elusive.

Previous work has revealed extensive variation in life history traits among genotypes, including trade-offs in general growth performance (including high dispersal ability) and formation of specialized dispersal morphs (Fjerdingsstad et al., 2007). Later work also revealed dispersal plasticity regarding conspecific density, which could be partly explained by morphological differences (body size and shape) among genotypes (Pennekamp et al., 2014)

In this study, we investigate the relationships between small-scale individual movement (i.e. cell trajectories), dispersal (i.e. emigration rate) and morphological features (i.e. body size and shape) across 44 genotypes of *Tetrahymena thermophila*. We characterized the movement behaviour in terms of activity (number of actively moving cells) and quantitative movement behaviour (speed and the characteristic scale of autocorrelation) via video-based cell tracking (Pennekamp, Schtickzelle & Petchey, 2015). In addition, we measured morphological properties of each genotype, as well as its dispersal rate across the two-patch system. With this data, we addressed the following questions:

- 1) Is there variation in movement behaviour within genotypes (between dispersers and residents) and among genotypes?
- 2) Can this movement variation be explained by morphology (cell size and shape)?



3) How much is the dispersal rate driven by differences in the underlying movement behaviour (activity and movement differences among genotypes)?

## Materials and Methods

### Model organism

*Tetrahymena thermophila* is a 30-50 µm unicellular, ciliated protozoan inhabiting freshwater ponds and streams in the eastern part of North America, where it naturally feeds on patches of bacteria and dissolved nutrients (Doerder & Brunk, 2012). We used a set of 44 genetically distinct genotypes (clonally reproducing as isolated lines) differing in several life history traits (Fjerdingstad et al., 2007; Schtickzelle et al., 2009; Chaine et al., 2010; Pennekamp et al., 2014). All genotypes are stored in suspended animation (frozen in liquid nitrogen) and can be ordered from the Tetrahymena Stock Center (<https://tetrahymena.vet.cornell.edu/>). Genotypes were kept as isolated monocultures in “common garden” conditions over a large number of generations (> 100) after defrosting, under axenic conditions in Proteose peptone medium enriched with yeast extract, at constant 27°C in a light controlled incubator with a 14:10 h light/dark cycle both prior and during the experiment. Refer to the supplementary material (section 1) for additional information on these genotypes and details of culture conditions.

### Experimental quantification of dispersal and movement parameters

We quantified dispersal rate and movement parameters of *T. thermophila* cells using a fully factorial experimental design implying two factors of interest: the genotype (44 genotypes) and the dispersal status (dispersers vs residents). We used the same standardized two-patch system (subsequently referred to as dispersal system) developed in previous work (Fjerdingstad et al., 2007; Schtickzelle et al., 2009; Chaine et al., 2010; Pennekamp et al., 2014), consisting of two 1.5 mL microtubes connected by a silicon pipe (internal diameter 4mm, tube length 17mm), filled with medium (see supplementary material, Figure S1). To start the experiment, cells of a

single genotype were pipetted into the “start” tube to obtain a density of 300000 cells/mL, an intermediate cell density commonly observed under our culturing conditions. After mixing the medium to distribute cells evenly in the start tube and 30 minutes of acclimation, the connecting pipe was opened, and cells could freely disperse. At the end of the experiment after six hours, the pipe was closed by a clamp and five independent samples were taken from both the start and the target tubes of each dispersal system. Cells found in the “start” or “target” are subsequently referred to “residents” or “dispersers”, respectively, the two modalities possible for the dispersal status variable. Five dark field images (one for each chamber; resolution: 5616 x 3744 pixels) and one 40 s long video (of a randomly chosen chamber; HD resolution: 1920 x 1080 pixels; 25 frames per second) were then taken using a Canon EOS 5D Mark II mounted on a Nikon Eclipse 50i microscope with a 4x lens; the real size of the imaged area is about 6.3 x 4.5 mm and was not bounded by external borders, hence cells could swim in and out the viewing field. Supplementary material (section 2) gives additional information about the experimental protocol and material used.

Images were treated using an objective and automated image analysis workflow to count individual cells and record morphology descriptors (**cell size** and **cell shape**); this workflow is based on ImageJ (Schneider, Rasband & Eliceiri, 2012) and was carefully validated and extensively optimized to produce accurate and repeatable results (Pennekamp & Schtickzelle, 2013). **Dispersal rate** of a genotype was estimated as the ratio of density in the target tube to the overall density (start + target), i.e. the proportion of cells in the target.

Individual cell trajectories were obtained from the digital videos in a standardized and automated fashion with a workflow that was later transformed into the R package BEMOVI (Pennekamp, Schtickzelle & Petchey, 2015) and was successfully used in previous studies extracting movement characteristics from video sequences (Banerji et al., 2015; Fronhofer, Kropf & Altermatt, 2015; Griffiths et al., 2018). The position of each cell was followed over

all the 1000 frames (40 s long video with 25 frames per second; Figure S2). First, the **activity** level of cells was computed from videos as the ratio of cells that moved (trajectory duration > 1 s and minimum displacement > 50  $\mu\text{m}$ , i.e. one body length) divided by the total number of trajectories (moving and non-moving).

Then, trajectories were analysed with continuous time movement models (Fleming et al., 2014; Gurarie et al., 2017) to compute movement speed and linearity. Continuous time movement models are a natural choice for high-frequency sampling of video microscopy because they can deal with autocorrelation in the movement speed and positions. We used the *smoove* package in R (Gurarie et al., 2017) to fit a hierarchical family of correlated velocity model, basically continuous-time equivalents of the widely applied correlated random walk, with biologically intuitive parameters such as movement speed and the velocity autocorrelation timescale (a measure of the decay in directional persistence). For each genotype, we randomly subsampled 23 trajectories per replicate and tube resulting in a total of 6072 trajectories. The subsampling was necessary because analysis with continuous time movement models is computationally demanding due to the model selection procedure involved. Subsampling also ensured the same number of data points per genotype. For each trajectory, we fitted four models: an unbiased correlated velocity model (UCVM), an advective correlated velocity model (ACVM), a rotational correlated velocity model (RCVM) or a rotational advective correlated velocity model (RACVM). The best fitting model for a given trajectory was selected via a model selection procedure based on the Akaike information criterion (AIC), and parameters of the model estimated. For each trajectory, we extracted two parameters for further analysis: the **movement speed** (in root mean square) and the velocity autocorrelation timescale (parameter  $\tau$ ), essentially a measure of **movement linearity**. When  $\tau$  tends towards zero, the movement approaches random Brownian motion, while  $\tau$  tending towards infinity indicates perfect linear motion (Gurarie et al., 2017). We used the velocity likelihood fitting method rather

than the exact fitting procedure implemented in Smoove, because Smoove currently supports the exact fitting approach for the UCVm model only. To check the robustness of the approximate fitting, we performed a check that indicated a negligible bias towards lower movement speed when using the approximate fitting (Figure S3). We therefore proceeded with the approximate fitting approach. Before further analysis, we performed an outlier exclusion based on the Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) with a threshold of 3 (Leys et al., 2013) for the two parameters estimated. The supplementary material (section 3) gives additional details concerning trajectory reconstruction from video, cleaning and estimation of movement metrics.

In summary, each dispersal system produced measures for six response variables: two morphology descriptors (cell **size** and **shape**, extracted from images), three movement descriptors (**activity**, **speed**, and **linearity** extracted from videos), and **dispersal rate** (computed from cell densities extracted from images). For all statistical analyses, these response variables were aggregated to produce two values per dispersal system, one for the start tube (residents) and another for the target tube (dispersers); indeed, the true level of replication in this experiment was the dispersal system (genotype x dispersal status combination) and not the individual trajectory. With 3 dispersal systems (replicates) per genotype, sample size was 264 (44 genotypes \* 3 replicates \* 2 dispersal status); note that one dispersal system (genotype 32\_I) was discarded due to a technical failure of the dispersal system, meaning n=262. Cell size and shape were averaged over all cells found on the five images recorded per tube; activity was directly measured at the video level (1 measure per tube) and hence already “pre-aggregated” at the correct level; speed and linearity were averaged over the 23 trajectories analysed by continuous time movement models on each video; and dispersal rate was computed from densities averaged over the five images recorded per tube.

## Statistical analyses

To address our first question, activity and movement metrics (speed and linearity) were compared among genotypes and among dispersal status (disperser vs resident cells) using a three-way ANOVA, with genotype and dispersal status as crossed and fixed effects, and replicate as random effect nested in genotype but crossed with dispersal status. Genotype was considered as a fixed effect, despite its common consideration as a random effect (e.g. Crawley, 2007). This is because the set of genotypes cannot be considered as a random sample of the genetic variation exhibited by the species in the wild (some genotypes were selected due to previous results or based on their phenotypic characteristics, some others were created by inbreeding in the laboratory). Dispersal status was crossed with replicate because the data for the two statuses (disperser and resident, i.e. target and start tubes respectively) were paired for each dispersal two-patch system. Speed and linearity (tau) were ln-transformed to improve normality.

All cells belonging to the same genotype should have the same genetic make-up; however, environmental differences encountered during the cell life cycle may lead to different morphologies and cell states. Therefore, to answer our second question, we tested whether differences in movement behaviour between residents and dispersers may be explained by morphological differences such as cell size and shape. To see if there were differences between residents and dispersers, we built ANCOVA models that related movement speed and linearity to morphology properties (size and shape) across genotypes, accounting for differences due to dispersal status. As some of the observed variation may be due to variation across replicates, we investigated how within replicate differences in morphology affect differences in movement. We used the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) to determine the most parsimonious model, i.e. the simplest model (in terms of number of parameters) within 2 units ( $\Delta AIC < 2$ ) of the best model (i.e. with the lowest AIC).

To address our third question about the power of movement behaviour to predict dispersal rate, we assessed how much variation in dispersal rate was explained by genotype-specific activity, movement speed, movement linearity and all predictors together. We used the  $R^2$  of a multiple regression and compared the three models with the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) to find the best fitting model. For this analysis, movement metrics (activity, movement speed and linearity) were averaged at the genotype level, i.e. over dispersers and residents.

## Results

### Q1: variation in movement behaviour within and among genotypes

Model selection across the four types of correlated velocity models revealed that the advective correlated velocity model (ACVM) was the most common across genotypes, indicating the genotypes show directed movement. The dispersal status did not change the overall pattern, but genotypes showed variation in the relative frequencies of movement models (Figure 1). Genotypes differed in activity (min. 39% to max. 70% of total cell population moving) and movement parameters extracted from the correlated velocity models: movement speed (min. 75 to max. 289  $\mu\text{m/s}$ ) and linearity (tau: min. 0.039 to max. 0.13). Additionally, a highly significant difference was shown between dispersal status: compared to residents, dispersers were characterized by a higher activity (0.62  $\pm$  0.05 vs. 0.57  $\pm$  0.08) and faster and more linear movements (speed  $\pm$  SD: 171  $\pm$  52.5  $\mu\text{m/s}$  vs. 139  $\pm$  52.0; tau: 0.0804  $\pm$  0.0271 vs. 0.0602  $\pm$  0.0244). For the majority of genotypes the dispersers moved faster and more linear, while for some genotypes the opposite was observed (significant genotype  $\times$  dispersal status interaction for both movement metrics; Table 1, Figure 2). Across genotypes the speed and linearity strongly positively co-varied ( $b = 0.000383$ ,  $t = 10.961$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), meaning faster cells also swam straighter. Neither intercept nor slope differed between residents and dispersers (Figure S4).

## **Q2: link between movement behaviour and morphology**

First, the influence of cell morphology on cell movement across genotypes and replicates was analysed (Figure 3). The most parsimonious model indicated a positive effect of size on movement speed in addition to the higher speed generally found in dispersers (Tab. S2). Speed was also affected by shape differences: more elongated disperser cells moved faster, whereas the opposite was observed for residents (Tab. S2). We also found that larger cells moved straighter. The slope of this relationship did not differ among dispersal status, however, dispersers moved straighter on average (Tab. S3). The relationship between shape and linearity again was dependent on the dispersal status: whereas higher elongation led to more linear movement for dispersers, residents showed no pattern with higher elongation (Tab. S3). Within genotypes, larger relative size of dispersers compared to residents led to higher relative movement speed, whereas a larger relative elongation resulted in a decrease in relative speed (Figure S5, Tab. S4-S5).

## **Q3: predicting dispersal rate based on movement parameters**

Consistent with previous experiments, we observed major differences among genotypes in dispersal rate in the two-patch experiment (Figure 4). The genotypes had significantly different dispersal rates over 6 h (one-way ANOVA:  $F_{43,87} = 9.93$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), continuously distributed in the 7 - 71% range; the majority of genotypes had a dispersal rate lower than 50%. Variation among the 44 genotypes in activity and movement behaviour explained a substantial amount of the variation observed in their dispersal rates. Only considering activity explained 27% of the variation in dispersal rates among genotypes (AIC = -56.21). The genotype-specific movement linearity explained a lower amount of variation (24%, AIC = -54.55) while speed explained a larger percentage of the dispersal variation (37%, AIC = -62.86). Including activity, speed and linearity explained almost 50% of the variation in dispersal (47%, AIC = -

66.79). This result indicates that activity and movement features jointly influence the dispersal rate exhibited by a genotype and provide complementary information about dispersal.

## Discussion

We show that 44 genotypes of *Tetrahymena thermophila* kept in “common garden” conditions over many generations exhibit continuous variation in movement parameters (activity, movement speed and linearity). Activity, movement speed and linearity were found to be genotype-dependent, and differed with dispersal status. Although cells within the same genotype have the same genetic make-up, environmental differences encountered during the cell life cycle may lead to different movement behaviours. We show that some of the movement variation can indeed be explained by morphological differences among genotypes and this may explain also within genotype variation. Finally, movement variation and cell activity was highly predictive of dispersal, explaining 47% of the observed variation.

## Genotype-based movement behaviour differences

So far there are a limited number of model systems where the genetic basis of dispersal has been studied in detail (summarized by Wheat, 2012). In *Drosophila*, allelic variation in the candidate gene *for* is known to influence the foraging behaviour of larvae; additionally recent research has demonstrated that phenotypic and genotypic variation mainly due to the *for* gene also influences adult dispersal distances (Edelsparre et al., 2014). Interestingly, the protein encoded by the *for* gene in *Drosophila*, a cGMP-dependent protein kinase, responsible for the observed behavioural variation in foraging, is also known to influence cilia-mediated chemotaxis in *T. thermophila* (Leick & Chen, 2004). Another example is the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans* where the *npr1* gene is associated with both foraging strategy and dispersal behaviour (Gloria-Soria & Azevedo, 2008). Finally, dispersal is heritable in the butterfly *Melitaea cinxia* on the Aland archipelago: young and isolated populations have higher



frequencies of dispersive female individuals carrying the *PGI* genotype, a genotype associated with higher flight metabolic rate that increases the probability to reach such habitats (Haag et al., 2005). These examples show that genetic links between movement and dispersal exist and are consistent with our results, where movement over short spatio-temporal scales correlates with dispersal over much larger spatio-temporal scales. *T. thermophila* may be a good model species for studying these questions using experimental evolution approaches. Promising directions for future research would be to understand how different selection pressures for movement (within patches) and dispersal (among patches) interact and affect eco-evolutionary dynamics in metapopulations (Van Petegem et al., 2015; Jacob et al., 2015a, 2017, 2018) and during range expansions (Fronhofer & Altermatt, 2015), contributing to a broader understanding of spatial patterns in ecology.

### **Movement differences between dispersers and residents, and their relationship with morphology**

We have found significant variation in movement within genotypes, which was modulated by the genotype (significant genotype by dispersal status interaction): disperser cells within the same genotype moved faster and straighter than residents, suggesting different movement strategies, which were realized to different degrees by different genotypes. These differences are partly explained by cell morphology co-varying with movement. This is expected, as the energetic costs of movement of microscopic organisms in aquatic environments are heavily influenced by their morphology such as cell elongation and size (Mitchell, 2002; Young, 2007). Indeed, we found that larger cells moved faster, regardless of their dispersal status. The shape of the cells also influenced speed and linearity: dispersing cells that were more elongated moved faster and more linear, whereas resident cells did not show such a relationship. The differences in movement speed are likely due to different costs associated with motion in the liquid medium, with larger cells potentially having larger energy reserves and/or stronger

movement machinery (Mitchell, 2002). This is corroborated by the fact that size always favoured faster movement, even when accounting for the genotype effect (see Figure S4). Our results therefore closely agree with recent findings about a general allometric relationship between body size and movement speed (Hirt et al., 2017a,b).

We have shown that movement variation can be partly explained by different cell sizes and shapes. This is in line with previous findings on the condition dependence of dispersal that indicated that cell size and shape have an influence on the dispersal propensity (Pennekamp et al., 2014). However, in contrast to dispersal, larger and more elongated cells move faster and straighter, whereas more elongated and smaller cells disperse more. This contrasting result suggests that although larger cells may be superior in terms of movement ability, they may not disperse as much as expected as other causes of dispersal may be more important; for instance, dispersal decisions may be taken as a function of competitive ability rather than movement ability *per se* (Fronhofer et al., 2015). If cell size positively co-varies with competitive ability, smaller cells may disperse to escape the local competition although they have relatively weaker movement capabilities.

Aggregation behaviour of *T. thermophila* ciliates is another candidate for explaining movement differences because aggregation affects the spatial cohesion of a population and is a proxy for cooperative behaviour (Schtickzelle et al., 2009; Chaine et al., 2010; Jacob et al., 2015b). In a previous study, genotypes characterized by different degrees of aggregation did not show any relationship with dispersal (Schtickzelle et al., 2009). Instead aggregation co-varied with the occurrence of specialized dispersal morphs, which only appear during prolonged periods of starvation. Given the strong correlation we found between dispersal and movement, aggregation seems less likely to be a causal driver of the observed differences in movement, albeit information about cooperative strategies was found to influence dispersal decisions (Jacob et al., 2015b).

## Explaining dispersal rate with activity and movement variation

The amount of variation explained increased from 27% accounting only for genotype-specific cell activity level, to 37% when considering only genotype-specific movement speed, and up to 47% when considering genotype-specific activity and movement. Activity and movement hence provide complementary information about dispersal. For instance, in certain genotypes, individual cells may move faster and straighter, but their activity level may be lower, compared to a less mobile genotype where cells are generally more active. The increasing amount of variation explained in our study supports the claim of previous studies that behavioural differences are important for the correct prediction of large scale population distributions from small scale movement observations (Morales & Ellner, 2002; Newlands, Lutcavage & Pitcher, 2004). However, our results also indicate that other processes, including subtle behavioural differences among genotypes to enter narrow tubes, may contribute to the observed variation in dispersal. As the causes of movement and dispersal are not entirely known for each genotype in our study, both positive and negative influence on the genetic variation are plausible as one cause (e.g. density of conspecifics) may be more important for some genotypes than for others (Pennekamp et al., 2014).

## What are the consequences of the geno- and phenotypic variation in movement behaviour observed in our study?

Natural populations of *Tetrahymena thermophila* ciliates are often constituted of multiple genotypes (Doerder et al., 1995), which may differ in movement behaviour as shown here. Modelling work has shown that communities/populations consisting of multiple phenotypes can actually show faster invasion speeds than that of the fastest monomorphic population alone (Elliott & Cornell, 2012). This was, however, only the case if the two phenotypes, i.e. a resident and a dispersive type, showed co-variation between growth rate and dispersal ability (e.g. well

growing but poorly dispersing resident vs. poor growing and well dispersing establisher) and if the ratio between genotypes in these parameters varied two- to ten-fold. Looking at the variation of our genotypes (Figure 4), we see that the ratio in dispersal rate can be up to ten-fold depending on the genotypes contrasted. This suggests that with a known variation in growth rate with a factor of about two (Pennekamp, 2014), accelerating invasions of *Tetrahymena* are possible, if natural populations are more phenotypically diverse. Validating these predictions in experiments with mixed populations and their link with local adaptation would be a fruitful avenue for future research.

## Conclusions

Our study showed a close link between movement and dispersal on multiple levels. Dispersal predictions steadily improved when genotype differences in both activity level and movement behaviour were considered. This highlights that predictions of dispersal will benefit from a detailed understanding of the underlying movement behaviour. To move beyond short-term ecological predictions of dispersal dynamics, e.g. range expansions and range shifts due to environmental change, we would need to further improve our understanding of how movement is affected by environmental variation and the relative fitness prospects of cells if staying in their current habitat patch or emigrating to another patch, which can lead to habitat choice, which has been shown in the species linked to temperature (Jacob et al., 2017, 2018).

## Acknowledgments

Virginie Thuillier and Linda Dhondt provided valuable help during the experiment and data collection. F. P. Doerder kindly provided a collection of 22 wild type genetic lines of *T. thermophila*. We thank Delphine Legrand, Emanuel Fronhofer, Staffan Jacob, Camille Turlure,

436 Justin Calabrese and anonymous reviewers for providing valuable comments on earlier drafts  
437 of the manuscript. This is publication BRCXXX of the Biodiversity Research Centre.

438

## 439   References

- 440   Austin D, Bowen WD, McMillan JI. 2004. Intraspecific variation in movement patterns: modeling  
441       individual behaviour in a large marine predator. *Oikos* 105:15–30. DOI: 10.1111/j.0030-  
442       1299.1999.12730.x.
- 443   Baguette M, Stevens VM, Clobert J. 2014. The pros and cons of applying the movement ecology  
444       paradigm for studying animal dispersal. *Movement Ecology* 2:13. DOI: 10.1186/s40462-014-  
445       0013-6.
- 446   Baguette M, Van Dyck H. 2007. Landscape connectivity and animal behavior: functional grain as a  
447       key determinant for dispersal. *Landscape Ecology* 22:1117–1129.
- 448   Banerji A, Duncan AB, Griffin JS, Humphries S, Petchey OL, Kaltz O. 2015. Density- and trait-mediated  
449       effects of a parasite and a predator in a tri-trophic food web. *Journal of Animal Ecology*  
450       84:723–733. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.12317.
- 451   Bonte D, Dahirel M. 2017. Dispersal: a central and independent trait in life history. *Oikos* 126:472–  
452       479. DOI: 10.1111/oik.03801.
- 453   Bonte D, Dyck HV, Bullock JM, Coulon A, Delgado M, Gibbs M, Lehouck V, Matthysen E, Mustin K,  
454       Saastamoinen M, Schtickzelle N, Stevens VM, Vandewoestijne S, Baguette M, Barton K,  
455       Benton TG, Chaput-Bardy A, Clobert J, Dytham C, Hovestadt T, Meier CM, Palmer SCF,  
456       Turlure C, Travis JMJ. 2012. Costs of dispersal. *Biological Reviews* 87:290–312. DOI:  
457       10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00201.x.
- 458   Bowler DE, Benton TG. 2005. Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating  
459       individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biological Reviews* 80:205–225.
- 460   Chaine AS, Schtickzelle N, Polard T, Huet M, Clobert J. 2010. Kin-based recognition and social  
461       aggregation in a ciliate. *Evolution* 64:1290–1300.

462 Chapperon C, Seuront L. 2011. Variability in the motion behaviour of intertidal gastropods:  
 463 ecological and evolutionary perspectives. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the*  
 464 *United Kingdom* 91:237–244.

465 Clobert J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM. 2012. *Dispersal Ecology and Evolution*. Oxford  
 466 University Press.

467 Clobert J, Le Galliard JF, Cote J, Meylan S, Massot M. 2009. Informed dispersal, heterogeneity in  
 468 animal dispersal syndromes and the dynamics of spatially structured populations. *Ecology*  
 469 *Letters* 12:197–209.

470 Crawley MJ. 2007. *The R Book*. John Wiley & Sons.

471 Dahirel M, Olivier E, Guiller A, Martin M-C, Madec L, Ansart A. 2015. Movement propensity and  
 472 ability correlate with ecological specialization in European land snails: comparative analysis  
 473 of a dispersal syndrome. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 84:228–238. DOI: 10.1111/1365-  
 474 2656.12276.

475 Debeffe L, Morellet N, Bonnot N, Gaillard JM, Cargnelutti B, Verheyden-Tixier H, Vanpé C, Coulon A,  
 476 Clobert J, Bon R, Hewison AJM. 2014. The link between behavioural type and natal dispersal  
 477 propensity reveals a dispersal syndrome in a large herbivore. *Proceedings of the Royal*  
 478 *Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 281:20140873. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2014.0873.

479 Debeffe L, Morellet N, Cargnelutti B, Lourtet B, Coulon A, Gaillard JM, Bon R, Hewison AJM. 2013.  
 480 Exploration as a key component of natal dispersal: dispersers explore more than philopatric  
 481 individuals in roe deer. *Animal Behaviour* 86:143–151. DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.05.005.

482 Doerder FP, Brunk C. 2012. Natural populations and inbred strains of *Tetrahymena*. In: Kathleen  
 483 Collins ed. *Tetrahymena thermophila*. Methods in Cell Biology. Academic Press, 277–300.

484 Doerder FP, Gates MA, Eberhardt FP, Arslanyolu M. 1995. High frequency of sex and equal  
 485 frequencies of mating types in natural populations of the ciliate *Tetrahymena thermophila*.  
 486 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 92:8715–  
 487 8718.

488 Ducatez S, Legrand D, Chaput-Bardy A, Stevens VM, Freville H, Baguette M. 2012. Inter-individual  
489 variation in movement: is there a mobility syndrome in the large white butterfly *Pieris*  
490 *brassicae*? *Ecological Entomology* 37:377–385.

491 Edelsparre AH, Vesterberg A, Lim JH, Anwari M, Fitzpatrick MJ. 2014. Alleles underlying larval  
492 foraging behaviour influence adult dispersal in nature. *Ecology Letters* 17:333–339. DOI:  
493 10.1111/ele.12234.

494 Elliott EC, Cornell SJ. 2012. Dispersal Polymorphism and the Speed of Biological Invasions. *PLoS ONE*  
495 7:e40496. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0040496.

496 Fjerdingstad EJ, Schtickzelle N, Manhes P, Gutierrez A, Clobert J. 2007. Evolution of dispersal and life  
497 history strategies – *Tetrahymena* ciliates. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7:133. DOI:  
498 10.1186/1471-2148-7-133.

499 Flaherty EA, Ben-David M, Smith WP. 2010. Diet and food availability: implications for foraging and  
500 dispersal of Prince of Wales northern flying squirrels across managed landscapes. *Journal of*  
501 *Mammalogy* 91:79–91. DOI: 10.1644/09-MAMM-A-014R.1.

502 Fleming CH, Calabrese JM, Mueller T, Olson KA, Leimgruber P, Fagan WF. 2014. From Fine-Scale  
503 Foraging to Home Ranges: A Semivariance Approach to Identifying Movement Modes across  
504 Spatiotemporal Scales. *The American Naturalist* 183:E154–E167. DOI: 10.1086/675504.

505 Fronhofer EA, Altermatt F. 2015. Eco-evolutionary feedbacks during experimental range expansions.  
506 *Nature Communications* 6:6844. DOI: 10.1038/ncomms7844.

507 Fronhofer EA, Klecka J, Melián CJ, Altermatt F. 2015. Condition-dependent movement and dispersal  
508 in experimental metacommunities. *Ecology Letters* 18:954–963. DOI: 10.1111/ele.12475.

509 Fronhofer EA, Kropf T, Altermatt F. 2015. Density-dependent movement and the consequences of  
510 the Allee effect in the model organism *Tetrahymena*. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 84:712–722.  
511 DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.12315.

512 Fronhofer EA, Legrand D, Altermatt F, Ansart A, Blanchet S, Bonte D, Chaine A, Dahirel M, Laender  
513 FD, Raedt JD, Gesu L di, Jacob S, Kaltz O, Laurent E, Little CJ, Madec L, Manzi F, Masier S,



514 Pellerin F, Pennekamp F, Schtickzelle N, Therry L, Vong A, Winandy L, Cote J. 2018. Bottom-  
 515 up and top-down control of dispersal across major organismal groups. *Nature Ecology &*  
 516 *Evolution* 2:1859. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-018-0686-0.

517 Gloria-Soria A, Azevedo RBR. 2008. npr-1 regulates foraging and dispersal strategies in  
 518 *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Current Biology* 18:1694–1699.

519 Griffiths JI, Petchey OL, Pennekamp F, Childs DZ. 2018. Linking intraspecific trait variation to  
 520 community abundance dynamics improves ecological predictability by revealing a growth–  
 521 defence trade-off. *Functional Ecology* 32:496–508. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2435.12997.

522 Gurarie E, Fleming CH, Fagan WF, Laidre KL, Hernández-Pliego J, Ovaskainen O. 2017. Correlated  
 523 velocity models as a fundamental unit of animal movement: synthesis and applications.  
 524 *Movement Ecology* 5:13. DOI: 10.1186/s40462-017-0103-3.

525 Haag CR, Saastamoinen M, Marden JH, Hanski I. 2005. A candidate locus for variation in dispersal  
 526 rate in a butterfly metapopulation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*  
 527 272:2449–2456.

528 Hirt MR, Jetz W, Rall BC, Brose U. 2017a. A general scaling law reveals why the largest animals are  
 529 not the fastest. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1:1116. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-017-0241-4.

530 Hirt MR, Lauermaann T, Brose U, Noldus LPJJ, Dell AI. 2017b. The little things that run: a general  
 531 scaling of invertebrate exploratory speed with body mass. *Ecology* 98:2751–2757. DOI:  
 532 10.1002/ecy.2006.

533 Jacob S, Bestion E, Legrand D, Clobert J, Cote J. 2015a. Habitat matching and spatial heterogeneity of  
 534 phenotypes: implications for metapopulation and metacommunity functioning. *Evolutionary*  
 535 *Ecology* 29:851–871. DOI: 10.1007/s10682-015-9776-5.

536 Jacob S, Chaine AS, Schtickzelle N, Huet M, Clobert J. 2015b. Social information from immigrants:  
 537 multiple immigrant-based sources of information for dispersal decisions in a ciliate. *Journal*  
 538 *of Animal Ecology* 84:1373–1383. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.12380.

539 Jacob S, Laurent E, Haegeman B, Bertrand R, Prunier JG, Legrand D, Cote J, Chaine AS, Loreau M,  
 540 Clobert J, Schtickzelle N. 2018. Habitat choice meets thermal specialization: Competition  
 541 with specialists may drive suboptimal habitat preferences in generalists. *Proceedings of the*  
 542 *National Academy of Sciences* 115:11988–11993. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1805574115.

543 Jacob S, Legrand D, Chaine AS, Bonte D, Schtickzelle N, Huet M, Clobert J. 2017. Gene flow favours  
 544 local adaptation under habitat choice in ciliate microcosms. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*  
 545 1:1407. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-017-0269-5.

546 Jacob S, Wehi P, Clobert J, Legrand D, Schtickzelle N, Huet M, Chaine A. 2016. Cooperation-mediated  
 547 plasticity in dispersal and colonization. *Evolution* 70:2336–2345. DOI: 10.1111/evo.13028.

548 Kuefler D, Avgar T, Fryxell JM. 2012. Rotifer population spread in relation to food, density and  
 549 predation risk in an experimental system. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 81:323–329. DOI:  
 550 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01917.x.

551 Leick V, Chen F. 2004. Chemosensory behaviour and ciliary cyclic GMP-dependent protein kinase in  
 552 *Tetrahymena thermophila*. *European Journal of Protistology* 40:303–312. DOI:  
 553 10.1016/j.ejop.2004.05.006.

554 Leys C, Ley C, Klein O, Bernard P, Licata L. 2013. Detecting outliers: Do not use standard deviation  
 555 around the mean, use absolute deviation around the median. *Journal of Experimental Social*  
 556 *Psychology* 49:764–766. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.03.013.

557 Mancinelli G. 2010. Intraspecific, size-dependent variation in the movement behaviour of a brackish-  
 558 water isopod: A resource-free laboratory experiment. *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and*  
 559 *Physiology* 43:321–337. DOI: 10.1080/10236244.2010.512728.

560 Menden-Deuer S. 2010. Inherent high correlation of individual motility enhances population  
 561 dispersal in a heterotrophic, planktonic protist. *PLoS Computational Biology* 6:e1000942.

562 Mitchell JG. 2002. The energetics and scaling of search strategies in bacteria. *The American*  
 563 *Naturalist* 160:727–740.

564 Morales JM, Ellner SP. 2002. Scaling up animal movements in heterogeneous landscapes: the  
565 importance of behavior. *Ecology* 83:2240–2247.

566 Nathan R, Getz WM, Revilla E, Holyoak M, Kadmon R, Saltz D, Smouse PE. 2008. A movement  
567 ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. *Proceedings of the National*  
568 *Academy of Sciences* 105:19052–19059. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0800375105.

569 Newlands NK, Lutcavage ME, Pitcher TJ. 2004. Analysis of foraging movements of Atlantic bluefin  
570 tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*): individuals switch between two modes of search behaviour.  
571 *Population Ecology* 46:39–53. DOI: 10.1007/s10144-004-0169-9.

572 Niitepõld K, Smith AD, Osborne JL, Reynolds DR, Carreck NL, Martin AP, Marden JH, Ovaskainen O,  
573 Hanski I. 2009. Flight metabolic rate and PGI genotype influence butterfly dispersal rate in  
574 the field. *Ecology* 90:2223–2232. DOI: 10.2307/25592738.

575 O’Riain MJ, Jarvis JUM, Faulkes CG. 1996. A dispersive morph in the naked mole-rat. *Nature*  
576 380:619–621. DOI: 10.1038/380619a0.

577 Osborne KA, Robichon A, Burgess E, Butland S, Shaw RA, Coulthard A, Pereira HS, Greenspan RJ,  
578 Sokolowski MB. 1997. Natural behavior polymorphism due to a cGMP-dependent protein  
579 kinase of *Drosophila*. *Science* 277:834–836.

580 Pennekamp F. 2014. Swimming with ciliates: dispersal and movement ecology of *Tetrahymena*  
581 *thermophila*, PhD thesis. Dissertation Thesis. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Université  
582 catholique de Louvain.

583 Pennekamp F, Mitchell KA, Chaine A, Schtickzelle N. 2014. Dispersal propensity in *Tetrahymena*  
584 *thermophila* ciliates—a reaction norm perspective. *Evolution* 68:2319–2330. DOI:  
585 10.1111/evo.12428.

586 Pennekamp F, Schtickzelle N. 2013. Implementing image analysis in laboratory-based experimental  
587 systems for ecology and evolution: a hands-on guide. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*  
588 4:483–492. DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.12036.

589 Pennekamp F, Schtickzelle N, Petchey OL. 2015. BEMOVI, software for extracting behavior and  
590 morphology from videos, illustrated with analyses of microbes. *Ecology and Evolution*  
591 5:2584–2595. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.1529.

592 Ronce O. 2007. How does it feel to be like a rolling stone? Ten questions about dispersal evolution.  
593 *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* 38:231–253.

594 Ronce O, Clobert J. 2012. Dispersal syndromes. In: Clobert J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM eds.  
595 *Dispersal ecology and evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 119–138.

596 Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis.  
597 *Nature Methods* 9:671–675. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.2089.

598 Schtickzelle N, Fjerdingstad E, Chaine A, Clobert J. 2009. Cooperative social clusters are not  
599 destroyed by dispersal in a ciliate. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9:251.

600 Schtickzelle N, Joiris A, Van Dyck H, Baguette M. 2007. Quantitative analysis of changes in movement  
601 behaviour within and outside habitat in a specialist butterfly. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7:4.

602 Stevens VM, Trochet A, Van Dyck H, Clobert J, Baguette M. 2012. How is dispersal integrated in life  
603 histories: A quantitative analysis using butterflies. *Ecology Letters* 15:74–86. DOI:  
604 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01709.x.

605 Stevens VM, Turlure C, Baguette M. 2010. A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies. *Biological*  
606 *Reviews* 85:625–642.

607 Turchin P. 1998. *Quantitative Analysis of Movement: Measuring and Modeling Population*  
608 *Redistribution in Animals and Plants*. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates.

609 Turlure C, Schtickzelle N, Dyck HV, Seymoure B, Rutowski R. 2016. Flight Morphology, Compound Eye  
610 Structure and Dispersal in the Bog and the Cranberry Fritillary Butterflies: An Inter- and  
611 Intraspecific Comparison. *PLOS ONE* 11:e0158073. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0158073.

612 Van Petegem KHP, Pétillon J, Renault D, Wybouw N, Leeuwen TV, Stoks R, Bonte D. 2015. Empirically  
613 simulated spatial sorting points at fast epigenetic changes in dispersal behaviour.  
614 *Evolutionary Ecology* 29:299–310. DOI: 10.1007/s10682-015-9756-9.

615 Wheat CW. 2012. Dispersal Genetics: Emerging Insights from Fruitflies, Butterflies and Beyond. In:  
616 Clobert J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM eds. *Dispersal and spatial evolutionary*  
617 *ecology*. 95–107.

618 Young KD. 2007. Bacterial morphology: why have different shapes? *Current Opinion in Microbiology*  
619 10:596–600. DOI: 16/j.mib.2007.09.009.

620


621 **Tables**

622 **Table 1:** Three-way ANOVA to assess the effect of genotype and the dispersal status (i.e. difference between dispersers and residents) on three  
623 movement metrics: activity (proportion of moving cells), movement speed and linearity. Genotype and dispersal status were considered as  
624 crossed and fixed effects, and replicate as random effect nested in genotype but crossed with dispersal status because data from the two status  
625 were paired per replicate (i.e. the start and target tubes of one dispersal system). The column "denominator for F-test" indicates the error term  
626 used to test for each effect, according to the ANOVA model “-“ denote the factors that cannot be tested because the error has no degrees of  
627 freedom in this model.

628


Response variable			activity				speed: ln(speed)				linearity: ln(tau)			
Factor	Denominator for F-test	DF	SS	MS	F value	p	SS	MS	F value	p	SS	MS	F value	p
genotype	replicate (genotype)	43	0.872	0.020	2.88	< 0.0001	24.927	0.580	12.40	< 0.0001	24.666	0.574	7.50	< 0.0001
dispersal status (disperser vs resident)	replicate * dispersal status (genotype)	1	0.186	0.186	42.88	< 0.0001	3.193	3.193	149.28	< 0.0001	6.718	6.718	93.19	< 0.0001
genotype * dispersal status	replicate * dispersal status (genotype)	43	0.445	0.010	2.39	0.0003	3.977	0.092	4.32	< 0.0001	7.036	0.164	2.27	0.0006
replicate (genotype)	error	87	0.612	0.007	-	-	4.067	0.047	-	-	6.653	0.076	-	-
replicate * dispersal status (genotype)	error	87	0.377	0.004	-	-	1.862	0.021	-	-	6.272	0.072	-	-
error	na	0	0	-			0	-			0	-		
total		261	2.490				38.020				51.317			

## Figures




**Figure 1:** Model selection for the four types of continuous time movement models fitted to 23 randomly selected trajectories. Relative frequencies of the most parsimonious model shown for A) resident trajectories across genotypes B) disperser trajectories across genotypes. The ACVM model is the most represented, followed by the UCVM. Some trajectories are best represented by rotational variants (RACVM and RCVM).






**Figure 2:** Overview of among and within genotype variation in A) activity, B) speed and C) tau, i.e. linearity. Each line shows a genotype and its slope indicates differences in movement among status (disperser vs resident).



**Figure 3:** Relationships between movement metrics (speed and  $\tau$ , i.e. linearity), dispersal status (red and blue) and cell morphology (size and shape). Lines and confidence intervals show the partial effects of size and shape of the most parsimonious ANCOVA model ( $n=262$ ). Larger cells moved faster but not more linear, with an overall higher level in dispersing cells. In contrast, only in dispersing cells elongation resulted in faster and straighter movement, whereas the opposite was observed in resident cells.



**Figure 4:** The 44 genotypes differed in their dispersal rate in the two-patch experimental system over a period of 6 h. The point represents the mean dispersal and the error bars the standard error of the mean (n=3 per genotype).